



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,561	01/09/2001	James A. Munro	03971.P014	1230

7590 01/02/2004

Thomas S. Ferrill
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ARNOLD, ADAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2671

9

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/757,561

Applicant(s)

MUNRO, JAMES A.

Examiner

Adam Arnold

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner acknowledges the receipt and entry of the applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-15, 18-23, 25, 27-29, 33-40, 42-46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cronin, U.S. Patent No. 6,182,127. Referring to claim 1, Cronin discloses an apparatus comprising a multi-image viewer to display images within a single window (col. 3, line 65) in a network system (col. 1, line 58), the viewer enabling manipulation of a displayed image (col. 4, lines 38-39), the image being a raster graphics file (col. 6, line 52), each of the images having a separate data file (col. 1, line 60 and col. 5, line 53).

Referring to claim 2, Cronin discloses where the manipulation of an image consists of linking to an image (col. 6, line 6).

Referring to claim 3, Cronin discloses where the viewer comprises a web-based application (col. 1, line 61).

Referring to claim 4, Cronin discloses where the application is one in a group consisting of an Active-X control (col. 8, line 33).

Referring to claim 5, Cronin discloses where the window consists of a browser (col. 1, line 65).

Referring to claim 6, Cronin discloses where the window is defined by a page description language (HTML—col.1, line 64).

Referring to claim 7, Cronin discloses where the viewer comprises a computer-readable medium containing a program (col. 2, lines 6-8).

Referring to claim 8, Cronin discloses where the network system is one in a group of a client server system (col. 2, lines 6-14).

Referring to claim 10, Cronin discloses where the displayed image comprises a multi-resolution capability (col. 3, line 31).

Referring to claim 11, Cronin discloses where the viewer manipulates the images as a group as well as individually (col. 8, lines 44-49).

Referring to claim 12, Cronin discloses a module to determine which part of an image will appear in the window and then request that data (col. 4, lines 45-60).

Referring to claim 13, Cronin discloses a module to calculate geometric coordinates of a portion of the displayed image to appear in the window and then request the block data (col. 4, lines 60-67).

Referring to claim 14, Cronin discloses a module to display multiple images at different resolutions (col. 3, line 31).

Referring to claim 15, Cronin discloses where the image has a hierarchical structure (col. 4, lines 50-1).

Referring to claim 18, Cronin discloses a module to decode and display images within the window (col. 3, lines 24-26).

Referring to claim 19, Cronin discloses a module to keep track of data in the window and data stored in cache (col. 4, lines 40-57).

Referring to claim 20, Cronin discloses a module to scale the displayed image with data stored in a cache until the viewer decodes the data (col. 4, lines 52-57).

Referring to claim 21, Cronin discloses a module to request data only for the displayed image to appear in the window (col. 7, lines 14-17).

Referring to claim 22, Cronin discloses a module to request all data pertaining to image but only to decode a portion of the data to appear (col. 7, lines 14-29).

Referring to claim 23, Cronin discloses a module to request and decode data corresponding to an actual area of an image, blocks of data surrounding the image (col. 7, line 18), and data for one level of higher resolution (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Referring to claim 25, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 27, Cronin discloses a predetermined setting to cause a client to request more data for the displayed image (col. 7, lines 21-24).

Referring to claim 28, Cronin discloses where the predetermined setting is a size of the image (col. 6, line 8).

Referring to claim 29, Cronin discloses where the predetermined setting comprises a value set at the time of the creation of the web page (col. 7, lines 21-24).

Art Unit: 2671

Referring to claim 33, Cronin discloses a client having a memory (col. 3, lines 7-10), an image database (or "library") associated with the server (col. 6, line 5) and the other limitations which were discussed in the rejection to claim 1 above.

Referring to claim 34, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 35, the remarks directed to claim 20, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 36, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 37, the remarks directed to claim 11, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 38, the remarks directed to claims 1 and 6, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 39, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 40, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 42, the remarks directed to claim 20, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 43, the remarks directed to claim 30, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 44, the remarks directed to claims 1 and 6, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 45, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 46, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 48, the remarks directed to claim 20, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 49, the remarks directed to claim 30, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 50, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9, 16, 24, 26 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin in view of Knowlton, U.S. Patent No. 5,973,692. Referring to claim 9, Cronin does not disclose where the image has a folder with a hierarchical structure. Knowlton discloses a

directory with a hierarchical structure (col. 19, lines 17-24). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a image directory with a hierarchical structure. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to provide an aid to the user to select graphics images (col. 19, line 22).

Referring to claim 16, the remarks directed to claim 9, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 24, the remarks directed to claim 9, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 26, Knowlton discloses a subfolder as shown in the remarks to claim 9 above.

Referring to claim 30, Cronin does not disclose a predetermined setting having a value below which a representation of the object is displayed and above which the object is displayed. Knowlton discloses a predetermined setting having a value below which a representation of the object is displayed and above which the object is displayed (col. 17, lines 50-57). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a predetermined setting having a value below which a representation of the object is displayed and above which the object is displayed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to save computer resources and provide valuable information to the graphics user.

Referring to claim 31, Knowlton discloses an image as shown in the remarks to claim 30 above.

Referring to claim 32, Cronin does not disclose a predetermined setting having a value below which the object is not displayed and above which the object is displayed. Knowlton discloses a predetermined setting having a value below which the object is not displayed and above which the object is displayed (col. 17, lines 50-57). At the time the invention was made it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a predetermined setting having a value below which the object is not displayed and above which the object is displayed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to save computer resources and provide valuable information to the graphics user.

5. Claims 17, 41 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin in view of Chiu, U.S. Patent No. 5,909,518. Referring to claim 17, Cronin does not disclose image compression according to a block based integer wavelet transform scheme. Cronin does disclose image compression (col. 8, line 36). The applicant discloses in paragraph 50 a block-based integer wavelet transform entropy coding scheme found in Chiu (col. 2, line 60). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a block-based integer wavelet transform entropy coding scheme for compression. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because wavelet transform is a standard data compression scheme and the type of compression scheme used would not affect the nature of the invention.

Referring to claim 41, the remarks directed to claim 17, above, apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 47, the remarks directed to claim 17, above, apply equally to this claim.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 20, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Pages 12 through 15 of the applicant's amendment assert that Cronin does not disclose displaying multiple graphic images in a window, each having a separate data file. The

applicant is directed to column 5, line 46 of Cronin which states: "To support tiling and caching of many images on the same image view server, each view tile must be uniquely identified for reference by the Web browser with a view tile URL. This uniqueness is accomplished through a combination of storage location and view tile naming." In spite of the applicant's other listed passages, this particular passage serves to disclose displaying multiple graphic images in a window, each having a separate data file.

On page 16 of the amendment, the applicant asserts that independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of Knowlton and Cronin because Cronin does not concurrently displaying multiple images in a single window and each of the concurrently displayed images having a separate data file. The previous paragraph points out that Cronin does in fact disclose this limitation. The remainder of the applicant's arguments rest on the same assertion as the one stated above.

The rejections to these claims stand.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2671

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Adam Arnold** whose telephone number is **703-305-8413**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays between 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman, can be reached at (703) 305-9798.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


RICHARD HESTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
CRY CENTER 2600